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INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2012-2013

February 14, 2013

3:30pm, HMSU Dede III

**Minutes**

Present: V. Sheets, A. Anderson, R. Baker, C. Ball, Scott Buchanan, Stan Buchanan, J. Buffington, J. Conant, B. El Mansour, C. Fischer, E. Glendening, A. Gurovich, E. Hampton, D. Hantzis, M. Haque, M. Harmon, T. Hawkins, N. Hopkins, R. Johnson, B. Kilp, J. Kuhlman, M. Miller, A. Morales, C. Olsen, C. Paterson, R. Peters, T. Sawyer, E. Strigas, B. Yousif, K. Yousif

Absent: K. Bolinger, R. Fairchild, E. Lorenzen, C. Tucker

Ex officio: Provost J. Maynard

Deans: A. Comer (Library), L. Maule (Univ. College), B. Smith (SCOB), J. Murray (A&S), J. Gatrell (CGPS), R. Williams (CNHHS), K. Brauchle (Ext. Learning), and (B. Sims (COT)

Staff Council Representative: No representative

SGA: Jacoby Waldron

Special Purpose Faculty: Michelle (Micki) Morahn

Guests: R. English, L. Barratt, J. Powers, S. Powers, S. Frey, S. Hardin, G. Youngen, L. Spence, L. Brown, D. Malooley,

1. Memorials:
2. Louis Curcio-written and delivered by Dr. Leslie Barratt, Professor of Linguistics and Chairperson of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics on behalf of the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics.

*Louis Leroy Curcio was born in 1911 in Washington State. He studied at Whitman College from 1928 to 1933, majoring in French and publishing An Experimental Study of the Relative Efficiency of Teaching French Grammar and Vocabulary Formally Versus Informally. He was awarded a Bachelor of Arts and then went on to earn his Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1951.*

*Dr. Curcio taught French at ISU from 1962 to 1977, but his publications include books in both French and Spanish, including Nouveau Visage du Monde Français 1975 Rand McNally & Company and a cultural graded readers series for elementary school students in Spanish published by the American Book Company that included Ponce de León (co-authored with Carlos Teran) and Hernando de Soto****,*** *both in 1961 as well as Coronado and Los Caballeros de la Cruz in 1966*

*After his retirement in 1977, Dr. Curcio moved to Texas and then to La Jolla, California, where he passed away in December, 2012. He is survived by at least one of his two sons, Paul, who is an architect. His wife, Mary, died some years ago.*

*THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service and dedication which he gave to his students, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures (now Department of Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics) and to Indiana State University.*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.*

1. Patricia Clark-written by Dr. Ralph Oberste-Vorth, Chairperson and Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science on behalf of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science; delivered by Dr. Elizabeth Brown, Professor of Mathematics Education.

 *Patricia A. Clark completed a BS in 1963 and an MS in 1964, both at Indiana State University. In 1973, she completed an EdD in Mathematics Education at Indiana University.*

 *From 1963 to 1972, Clark planned and taught four lectures per week to approximately 1800 students on the Terre Haute and Evansville campuses via closed circuit television. She was truly at the forefront in distance education. Clark also developed and taught correspondence courses.*

 *During her thirty-six years at ISU, Clark served as Mathematics Coordinator for the College Challenge Program and she conducted workshops for teachers enrolled in the College Challenge Program.*

 *In the profession, she was an active member of the National Council of Teachers of America.*

 *After retiring in 2000, Clark served on the Board of Directors of the Southeastern Illinois Area on Aging, and she was a volunteer for Crawford County Senior Citizens, SHIP, and VITA.*

 *THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to her family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which she gave to her students, the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, and the University.*

 *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.*

1. Harold Boone-written and delivered by Dr. Robert English, Interim Chairperson Department of Built Environment, and Associate Dean, College of Technology.

*Harold Boone was a World War II Army veteran, a member of Dugger Masonic Lodge 721 for 50 years, and Sullivan American Legion Post 139.*

*Harold’s area of study was Industrial Education, completing his BS in 1952 and MS in 1954 at Indiana State University. He was a member of the Industrial Arts Club, where he served as secretary and treasurer, and a member of the Tau Kappa Epsilon Fraternity. He furthered his education with 37 additional graduate semester hours. Prior to joining our faculty in 1975, Mr. Boone served as a school superintendent, an educational consultant for the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, a supervisor of schoolhouse planning, and both a junior high and a high school teacher.*

*During his thirteen years at ISU, Harold served on a number of committees at the University level, including the Vocational-Technical Professional Development Coordinating Committee; at the College level, including the School of Technology Building Planning Committee; and at the Department level, including Curriculum and Course Committee. He was promoted to Associate Professor in 1982. Mr. Boone also participated in numerous professional and civic organizations, providing support throughout the state of Indiana. He was identified by many vocational directors, teachers, persons in leadership, and students as a distinctly superior teacher. His experience in facility planning and curriculum development and his extensive knowledge about the secondary school system of Indiana made him a valuable asset. He retired from Indiana State University in 1988.*

*THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, the Department of Industrial Technical Education, and the University.*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.*

1. Administrative Reports:

Provost J. Maynard

* *The President is out of town.*
* *The Board of Trustees will meet next week for two days beginning Thursday with a variety of seminars and concluding with the regular meeting on Friday. The seminars are open to the public and you are invited to attend.*
* *The search for the Dean of the Bayh College of Education is moving forward. The search committee by next week will have the semi-finalists identified and therefore interviews will be scheduled. Sometime by early March, those interviews will be conducted and from there a set of finalists will be identified to bring to campus toward the latter part of March. This will be in alignment to give the new Provost a voice in this process.*
1. Chair Report:

V.Sheets

 *Welcome all. We have a long agenda, so I’ll be brief.*

 *First, we have received all of the reports from the summer & fall taskforces and they have been sent out to committees.*

 *University College: CAAC, SAC, and FAC*

 *Textbooks: SAC and FAC*

 *Baccalaureate Programs: CAAC*

 *Administrative Structure: CAAC and FAC*

 *Each committee has been asked to review the report and make appropriate policy recommendations and handbook changes to be brought forward. The President has asked that we have responses to him by May 1. The reports will be sent to all senators along with any recommendations as they come forward from their respective committees.*

 *Second, it is mid-February, which means that Senate elections are just around the corner. If you are interested in running for Senate for next year, you should download the nomination form from the Senate website. Please encourage colleagues to consider running as well. Forms are due the Friday after Spring Break, which gives barely enough time to build our ballots and get results before they have to get together to select next year’s officers. If you are not sure of your own status, Tami has (or will post) an updated Senate roster that states the term of everyone’s election (as well their eligibility for re- election).*

 *Finally, I want to remind you that we have two more provost candidates scheduled for next week and the week after. I’m sure the search committee will value our input, and I encourage everyone to attend.*

1. Support Staff Report:

 No representative.

1. SGA Report:

*Just an update that the work funding application closes tomorrow February 15th!*

 *Also we would like to inform you all that next week will be SGA's Random Act of Kindness Week aka RAK Week! It will be a three day event at the fountain. The purpose is to do random acts of kindness in honor of the students and faculty that lost their lives in the Newtown shooting incident in Dec. of 2012. There will be a blue box by the fountain with the pictures and names of the children and faculty so you can write their name and an act of kindness that you did on a sheet of paper and place it in the blue box. At the end of the week we will send the box to Sandy Hook Elementary School so they can see that Indiana State supports them!*

1. Special Purpose Advocate Report

 No report.

1. 15 Minute Open Discussion
* *As you know, the library is in the process of ‘reinventing’ itself. We currently have a survey on the library homepage I would urge you to set aside 10 minutes and take it. It’s available through February 22. There is a chance to enter a drawing to win an iPad2. Authors/Artists will be February 27-3pm/3:30 with guest keynote: Chris Olsen. Celebrate books published by faculty in the last year, as well as the work of performing and visual artists and student research papers.*
* Question regarding Provost’s comment concerning “post-tenure review” in EC minutes 2-5-13. Provost response-*If I used those terms, it was an accident, not intended to imply anything different than the biennial review.*
* *I know that this is the fourth time I have asked a question about the impact on current students of the change in the minimum number of credit hours required for degree completion. But, as we approach advising and registration for the 2013-2014 year, I ask again for instruction concerning the application of the 120 total earned hour rule to current students. I understand the public statement to have been that the 2013 entering class requirement will be 120 hours; it is, of course, nonsensical to continue to hold students with an earlier catalog year to the 124 hour rule once the 120 hour rule is implemented. Students and Advisors need to know how to plan degree completion and they should be confident in their knowledge of the process by which current students can complete their degrees having earned 120-123 credit hours.* Provost response-*I will work very closely with Dr. Powers and CAAC to look into this.*
1. Business Items
2. Approval of Minutes from 12-6-12 and 1-10-13 [files 0 and 1]

 **MOTION TO APPROVE** minutes from 12-6-12 and 1-10-13 (N. Hopkins/A. Anderson; Vote: 29-0-1) Please strike line concerning report from Faculty Dismissal Committee on both sets of minutes. This is not a standing committee and no representative was present.

1. Non-tenure Track Review Policy (pending EC approval) [file 2]

[Approved by EC 2-12-13, (J. Conant/E. Lorenzen; Vote: 9-0-0)]

Revise sections 305.11.1 and 305.11.2 of the University Handbook to include a specified process of annual evaluation of Regular, non-tenure track and Temporary Faculty (Instructors and Lecturers, respectively) in accordance with section 305.2.3 requiring that faculty shall be regularly evaluated with established criteria and performance standards appropriate to their positions.

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the non-tenure track review policy for the handbook (A. Anderson/B. El Mansour; Vote: 29-0-1)

1. Reduction in Upper Level Credits (pending EC approval) [file 3]

[Approved by EC 2-12-13, (J. Conant/A. Anderson; Vote: 9-0-0)]

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the reduction in upper level credits from 50 to 45 effective immediately upon Board approval (J. Kuhlman/N. Hopkins; Vote: 30-0-0)

1. Automation and Control Engineering Technology Minor [file 4]

Minor using existing courses already being taught.

*Do any of the courses in this minor have a mathematics pre-requisite?* Response-*None other than Math 115.* Response-*People outside of technology might be interested in this but not everyone outside of technology has to take Math 115 or other courses listed. They may come here with only having taken Math 102. If you want them to have a certain level of mathematical knowledge, you need to say that.* Response-*This would require only very basic math knowledge.*

*Fifteen hours seems relatively small. Was there a logic to that number?* Response-*We already have minors for our other 3 programs along this line. This covers a lot of topics. Many of these courses, students already in technology have taken these. Our primary audience we are looking at is EET, CET, perhaps some IT students, MET students. It is 18 total, 15 in electronics.*

*In response to the math pre-requisite question, ECT 160 has no pre-requisites, ECT 165 has math competency or Math 115. 160 or 165, so there are no math pre-requisites.*

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the Automation and Control Engineering Technology Minor (J. Kuhlman/ A. Morales; Vote: 29-1-0)

*ECT 281 does have a pre-requisite of Math 115. The department will need to make the appropriate adjustments.*

1. Department merger for the library [file 5]

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the merger of the Reference department and circulation department within the library (B. Kilp/M. Miller; Vote: 29-0-0)

1. FEBC motion concerning medical coverage [file 6]

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the FEBC motion concerning medical coverage (K. Yousif/E. Strigas; Vote: 28-0-2)

1. Revised Biennial Evaluation Process [file 7 and 8]

*Throughout this process, FAC had three areas of concern:*

*The campus is not prepared for a meaningful, consequential review to begin September 1, 2013. Few departments have actually completed the task that was assigned over a year ago to delineate the standards by which faculty would be reviewed.*

*A concern with the permanent charge for FAC to review the process each time it is conducted.*

*A balance in this intent and conduct between summative and formative review so that the emphasis be placed where it should be on assisting faculty in improving their performance or continuing to maintain excellence rather than in punishment.*

*I believe our changes address these points.*

 *Paragraph 2 of the document reads, “This information may be used to inform any performance-based salary processes.” I thought it would be used. The way this reads, it looks like we could go through this entire exercise and then the administration could just throw it out and hand out performance based raises however they please. It seems “may” should be changed to “will”.* Response-*I think that may read that way because sometimes we may not be able to do it because there may not be money to do it.* Provost response-*I think it is appropriate to change“may” to “will”also.*

 *Under Process, Point 2, I have a problem with “enrollment figures” because final enrollment may be a lot different than first-day enrollment and there was no way to change those numbers.* Response-*Another date could be used to pull those enrollment figures. This could also be stated as “final enrollment”.*

 *Under Overall Performance Evaluation, Point 1, the language does not seem to allow for a possible fourth category, such as a chair or fellow. Also in this section, 60% seems awkward.* Response-*Maybe we could use “exceeds 59%”.* Response- *Maybe we could strike “three”, “third”, and “two” to include for the possibility of other categories.*

 **MOTION TO APPROVE** the revised biennial evaluation process (M.

 Miller/B. Yousif; Vote: 27-0-2)

 The revised Biennial Performance Evaluation procedures will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

1. Revision to constitution: temporary faculty advocate [file 9]

 **MOTION TO APPROVE** the revision to the Constitution: adding the temporary faculty advocate (N. Hopkins/E. Hampton; Vote: 28-0-0) Meets the 2/3 requirements for a Constitutional amendment.

1. Revision to constitution: voting rights [file 10 and 11]
* *Let me begin by saying that I’ve long had qualms about this prospect. Nine months ago, I cannot say I would have supported this. I’ve been around long enough that I’ve seen chairs and other administrators reign with terror, including strategically pitting the pre-tenure against the tenured faculty.*

*I’ve also—as expressed to many—had concerns about workload. Although I value the expertise that our PT and FT faculty bring to the classroom, expertise that I would like to have them bring to curricular discussions within the department—I see it as a fairly short step from “allowing” people to serve on university committees to “expecting” that they will do so, and I feel very strongly that people with 5-5 teaching loads should not do so. They owe no obligation to the university beyond teaching their classes to the best of their ability. I have long been opposed to anything that looks like it will increase this.*

*However, I have recently changed my mind on the voting matter, in large part due to the logic and reason provided by my colleagues on the executive committee—as well as by the Chair of FAC—Darlene Hantzis. Perhaps most important to my transition, however, was President Bradley—though I believe his effect was both unintended and likely unrealized. However, as I sat before him and insisted that only a body being represented could select its representatives, that is, that only the faculty could select faculty to serve on the provost’s search committee, that he had no say—the hypocrisy of my views regarding non TT faculty became apparent. It is logically inconsistent to argue that only front-line TT faculty can represent themselves on a committee while simultaneously arguing that non-TT faculty should NOT be able to represent themselves (or even to vote for their representatives).*

*My new ideology became further ingrained as I’ve forced myself to look at the matter through some other perspectives.*

*First, from the perspective of the FT, non-Tenure-Track faculty member. Here we have a group of people—many with terminal degrees and some, scholarly publications more recent a few of my tenured colleagues—who are made to feel like 2nd class citizens by virtue of our protectionism. I teach my Social Psychology students that “Inequality breeds prejudice,” and I have unfortunately witnessed such prejudice in some of my colleagues who seem to go out of their way to remind nonTenureTrack faculty of their positions. Continued inequality is sure to breed continued prejudice.*

*Second, from the perspective of the administration. We (the “traditional” faculty) have for years argued for better treatment of our non-Tenure-track colleagues. We argued for them to be given better wages, more benefits, and greater predictability to their lives in the form of longer-term and full-time contracts. This was based not only on the work they do, but also on their commitment to the institution. Many have served the university for years—showing more commitment than many (is it a 1/3 or more?) pre-tenure faculty who leave prior to coming up for tenure. The administration has acquiesced to our request to treat them like the committed professionals they are. Our failure to do so surely appears hypocritical.*

*Finally, from the perspective of the Board of Trustees. The BOTs job is to set policies for the institution and they rely on campus governance groups to provide perspective and advice. Students have representation. Staff and EAP both have representation. As do “faculty”—or at least some faculty. The BOT sees that one and only one group of full-time employees, employees getting health and retirement benefits, and employees who provide disproportionate service to the teaching mission of the institution, are excluded from discussions of pay and benefits, discussions of workload, and even discussions of curricular matters and academic freedom related to their teaching. From the employment perspective, this is unfair, and such unfair treatment of an employee group cannot be sustained.*

*Other institutions have taken this step and the university has not collapsed. The AAUP endorses it. When considered from every angle, we should too.*

* *I want to share with you as a faculty member and not in my role as chair of FAC three reasons that persuade me to support this motion.*

*First, I support this motion because of a rather routine and common commitment to fairness and equality and the recognition that there is no equality without the means to impact decisions through the exercise of one’s vote. All faculty members should be authorized to vote on matters allocated to faculty for deliberation and decision.*

*Secondly, my support takes guidance from our profession. I have been a long-time member of the AAUP and I respect its stewardship. Many of you know that AAUP published a new statement on the role of contingent faculty in university governance this summer; that statement was adopted by the organization in November 2012. It differs significantly from earlier statements and makes clear, precise, and absolute recommendations concerning definition of faculty and the allocation of voting rights. Recommendation One stipulates that all faculty, regardless of classification or appointment, should be included in the definition of faculty. Recommendation Two stipulates that “Eligibility for voting and holding office in college and university governance bodies should be the same for all faculty regardless of . . . status” (p 17).*

*The AAUP produced a thorough analysis of the impact of this kind of change in the definition of faculty. They identified concerns and not that such changes are problematic. Good people talk about the need to protect our colleagues against exploitation (expectations of increased labor through service, which is what participation in governance is) and against manipulation (being less secure about their future employment may produce a desire to please those perceived to have power to control or greatly influence their contract continuation or renewal or they may be directly pressured to do so). These are not unreasonable cautions. But, I concur with AAUP’s clear and absolute statement:*

*“However, no faculty member should be excluded from participation in governance because of the appointment conditions over which most have little control. The inclusion in governance roles of faculty in contingent appointments has problematic aspects, but it is crucial to establishing strong faculty governance.” We can and should address the complexity by bolstering protection of academic freedom for all, guaranteeing due process evaluations and right of appeal, and recognizing the appropriateness of criteria for participation in some governance service. We already limit participation in tenure and promotion reviews to tenured faculty; we can choose to identify other governance roles for which there should be a pre-requisite. For example, we may want to require one year as a faculty member at ISU prior to standing for election to Senate, but AAUP insists that such pre-requisites must apply to all faculty and not serve as a means to exclude only contingent faculty.*

*Finally, I support this motion because voting in favor of the motion here, today, is a vote to invite the full body of our Tenured and Tenure-Track colleagues to make the decision determining the allocation of rights to our colleagues who hold the position of Instructor. Regardless of your individual view of the “rightness” or “expediency” or “value” of the motion, this is the kind of motion for which we should allow the most public kind of democratic deliberation. The story of the allocation of the privilege of participation in governance in our profession includes a long period during which only Full Professors held voting rights and then only tenured faculty and eventually tenure-track faculty. To fail to recognize the full population of our colleagues is to limit the power of our community and to diminish our profession.*

 **MOTION TO APPROVE** the revision to the Constitution: providing voting rights to instructors (B. Kilp/B. Yousif; Vote: 25-4-0) Meets the 2/3 requirements for a Constitutional amendment.

1. CAAC nomination: Randy Peters to replace P. Cochrane, Alister McLeod to replace S. Frey.

 **MOTION TO APPROVE** the CAAC nominations of Randy Peters and Alister McLeod to replace Phil Cochrane and Susan Frey (N. Hopkins/M. Harmon; Vote: 29-0-0)

1. Informational Items
2. Retention and Academic Performance Reports [files 12 and 13]
* *I appreciate that we have been given this information. I think it is really important to honor the idea that everyone has a role to play. Could we get some information as we go forward beyond this first year of planning tools like what are the benchmarks and also some kind of cost/benefit analysis.*

* *I would also like to see this information broken down by departments.*
* *You are all welcome to participate in the House Calls program. This is an opportunity for administration and faculty to go into the residence halls and meet with the students. This program will be next week, Wednesday, February 20.*

1. Standing Committee Reports
* Academic Affairs Committee-We are meeting Monday for the first time this semester.
* Arts Endowment Committee-Our work has been completed for the year.
* Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee-We continue to meet every week. We are passing new proposals, about 20 in the past 2 weeks, as well as reviewing the task force documents.
* Faculty Affairs Committee-The Faculty Affairs Committee is meeting bi-weekly (or weekly). We have received four new charges, nearly completed the review of constitutional changes made by three Colleges, and begun our response to the summer task reports on Textbook and the University College.
* Faculty Economic Benefit Committee-We are meeting next week.
* Graduate Council- Grad Council met 2.12.13. The council approved the certificate program in genomic advocacy. It also approved a catalog change from Dean Gatrell that provides for a regular mechanism for a department to remove a graduate student for cause other than his/her g.p.a. falling below 3.0. This is very rare, but it has happened in the past. Dean Gatrell argued that the CGPS should have a regular policy in place that each department can follow. Finally, Tom Sawyer reported for the Task Force on Assessment and Quality of graduate programs. Their second draft was reviewed, with comments and concerns related back to the TF. The TF is on schedule to make final recommendations by the end of the semester, which will allow for reviews of graduate programs to begin next year. As of now they plan to start with the CNHHS in 2013-14 and CAS in 2014-15.
* Student Affairs Committee-SAC met January 30, 2013 and will meet again on February 27. We are on track to deal with all charges in a timely manner.
* University Research Committee- URC has made a recommendation about the possible merger of URC and AEC and discussed the reimbursement of research subjects draft policy for human subject participants.
1. Adjournment

 **MOTION TO ADJOURN** (T. Hawkins/J. Conant; Vote: 29-0-0) at 5:05